Wisconsin State Planning Grant

HIPP Case-by-Case Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation

July 15, 2005

Prepared by APS Healthcare, Inc. 210 E. Doty Street, Suite 210 Madison, WI 53703

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Data Sources	2
Method	2
Step One	
Step Two	2
Step Three	3
Step Four	3
Step Five	
Step Six	
Step Seven	
Step Eight	5
Methodological Considerations	
Findings	(
Conclusion	,
Conclusion	
Appendix A	
Appendix B	1(

HIPP Case-by-Case Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation

Project Summary

Wisconsin's Health Insurance Premium Payment (HIPP) program was implemented in 1999 to leverage employer contributions, keep family members together, limit crowd-out, ease transition from public to private coverage, strengthen the private insurance market and eliminate the stigma of public programs. To accomplish these goals, HIPP pays the enrollee's employer sponsored health insurance premium, coinsurance and deductibles in place of providing Medicaid coverage through programs like BadgerCare or the Medical Assistance Purchase Plan (MAPP). HIPP also pays for services not covered by the enrollee's health insurance through Medicaid fee-forservice. In order to remain cost-effective, the HIPP program screens each individual applicant to determine the likelihood that enrollment in HIPP will provide Wisconsin Medicaid with a cost savings. Prior to screening for cost-effectiveness, each applicant is reviewed based on the following criteria:

- 1. Does the applicant have access to family coverage?
- 2. Is the applicant's employer sponsored insurance a self-funded plan?¹
- 3. Does the applicant's employer contribute less than 40% towards the applicant's health insurance premium?
- 4. Does the applicant have any BadgerCare eligible children?

In a previous report written by APS in December 2004², these four criteria were examined to determine how they affect overall enrollment in HIPP. It was hypothesized that lifting one or more of these restrictions to enrollment may allow a number of cost-effective applicants access to HIPP. Based on available data and discussions with State Planning Grant (SPG) staff, APS decided to examine a subset of applicants who had been denied enrollment either because their employer did not contribute at least 40% towards their health care premium or because they did not have any BadgerCare eligible children.

In order to test the cost-effectiveness of enrolling members of these two groups, we have constructed an analysis that compares premium payments plus wrap-around benefits to the BadgerCare capitation rate. The wrap-around payments represent fee-for-service (FFS) Medicaid payments for services not covered under the enrollee's employer-sponsored coverage. Utilizing data gathered from paper HIPP applications provided by EDS, we analyzed a sample of applicants who were denied enrollment in HIPP either because their employer contributed less than 40% towards their health care premium or because they did not have any BadgerCare eligible children. We compared their actual BadgerCare expenditures based on age, gender and rate region adjusted capitation rates for anyone in the applicant's case with the total family health care premium the applicant identified on their HIPP application plus an estimated monthly wrap-

² HIPP Enrollment Process Review – Final Report – 12/2/2004.

¹ During the two year period from July 2002 through June 2004, a quarter of those individuals identified as "currently employed" in the Employer Verification of Insurance Coverage (EVIC) statistic reports compiled by the EDS HIPP unit had access to a self-funded plan. It is reported that HIPP program policy does not exclude selffunded plans; however, it appears that these applicants do not proceed through the HIPP enrollment process.

around cost based on our previous cost-effectiveness analysis.³ A detailed description of the analysis is located in the Method section below.

Data Sources

Data for this analysis come from four different sources. The basis for the analysis is a sampling of HIPP applicants who did not meet either the less than 40% employer contribution or the BadgerCare eligible children enrollment requirement as identified by EDS. The paper HIPP applications obtained from EDS were used to identify the employee's family health care coverage premium liability had they been allowed to enroll in HIPP. Eligibility records for these applicants and any individuals covered in their case file were drawn from the Medicaid Evaluation and Decision Support (MEDS) Recipient ODS data universe maintained by EDS. Current age, gender and rate-region capitation rate tables were also drawn from the MEDS universes. The estimated wrap-around costs come from actual wrap-around costs compiled for the *HIPP Program-Wide Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation*, *January 5*, 2005 analysis conducted by APS using the MEDS Claims Analysis universe.

A listing of the sources follows.

- 1) EDS HIPP paper applications
- 2) MEDS Recipient ODS universe
- 3) Capitation rate tables
- 4) HIPP Program-Wide Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation, January 5, 2005 Completed by APS Healthcare, Inc. (MEDS Claims Analysis universe)

Method

Step One

The first step in the analysis process was to determine which enrollment criteria were to be tested for potential cost savings. The two criteria selected were cases where the employer pays less than 40% of the employee's family health care premium and cases where the applicant has no BadgerCare eligible children. These criteria were chosen because they are easily defined and readily identifiable among the paper applications held by EDS. Additionally, it is reasonable to assume that **non-BadgerCare** Medicaid eligible children should not be significantly more costly than BadgerCare eligible children.

Step Two

Having identified the HIPP enrollment criteria to be tested, we then selected an analysis period. We chose the nine-month period beginning January 1, 2004 through September 30, 2004 based upon the number of available HIPP applications that were denied due to each of the above criteria during that period. In addition, this nine-month period provides for the most recent application data while still allowing a minimum of six months eligibility records to be updated/reconciled.

³ APS conducted a cost-effectiveness analysis of BadgerCare participants for calendar year 2003. Findings from that report, entitled *HIPP Program-Wide Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation*, *January 5*, 2005 were used to inform this analysis.

Step Three

EDS provided us with two batches of paper HIPP applications for the nine-month analysis period. One batch included denials based on the 40% requirement and the other included denials based on the BadgerCare eligible children requirement. EDS estimated that there were 1,031 applications in the 40% batch and 1,356 applications in the no BadgerCare eligible children batch. To generalize our findings to populations of this size required sample sizes of 281 and 300, respectively. Based on those figures, 311 and 330 applications were randomly selected for inclusion in the analysis, oversampling each batch by 30 to account for potential missing data. During the process of entering the application data, it became clear that there were fewer applications than originally estimated by EDS. There were 999 applications in the less than 40% batch and approximately 1,283 in the no BadgerCare eligible children batch. As a result, the final samples were reduced to 292 for the 40% group and 302 for the no BadgerCare eligible children group.

Step Four

We entered and/or calculated 30 variables from the HIPP applications (see Appendix A for a complete list). The most important variables for this analysis include the employees' share of their employee plus child⁴ health care coverage premium and the employees' share of their family health care coverage premium. However, this data was not complete for a number of applicants. Table 1 below shows the number of cases with valid premium data.

Table 1: Number of Applicants (Cases) with Health Care Premium Data by Type								
	Less Than	1 40%	No BadgerCa	re Children				
	Employee Plus Family Employee Plus Family							
	Child Coverage	Coverage	Child Coverage	Coverage				
Final Sample	292	292	302	302				
Valid Cases 251 262 251 269								
Percent Valid Cases	86%	90%	83%	89%				

In addition, the eligibility and effective dates for the employer sponsored insurance were very incomplete on the applications. Table 2 on the following page shows the number of cases with valid eligibility and effective dates.

APS Healthcare

⁴ The HIPP application forms do not collect individual or employee-only premium amounts, but rather request premium amounts for "Employee and Child" coverage. It is possible that employers who do not offer this option may be entering their employee-only premium on the applications. In addition, employees with BadgerCare (or Medicaid) eligible children who are only eligible for individual coverage through their employer may also prove to be cost-effective if allowed to enroll in HIPP; however, this data is not collected on the HIPP applications. Even if the individual's child/children have coverage through the other parent's insurance, the individual would be eligible for BadgerCare, which would pay for any services required by the children that are not covered by the other parent's insurance. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see the report *HIPP Enrollment Process Review – Final Report – December 2,2004*.

Table 2: Number of Applicants (Cases) with Employer Sponsored Health Insurance Eligibility and Effective Dates									
	Less Tha	an 40%	No BadgerC	are Children					
	With Eligibility	With Eligibility With Effective With Eligibility With Effective							
	Dates	Dates	Dates	Dates					
Final Sample	292	292	302	302					
Valid Cases	lid Cases 250 182 264 207								
Percent Valid Cases	86%	62%	87%	69%					

Based on the available data necessary to conduct the case-by-case cost-effectiveness analysis we chose to use the family coverage premium amount and by-pass the eligibility and effective dates altogether. The family coverage premium was selected for the analysis for three reasons:

- 1. It provides the largest number of valid cases for the analysis.
- 2. It provides the most conservative estimate of cost-effectiveness because it is more costly than employee plus child coverage.
- 3. It was not possible from the available application data to determine with any accuracy which applicant would be enrolling in family coverage and which would be enrolling in employee plus child coverage.

In the absence of valid eligibility or effective dates, we have made the assumption that each applicant in our analysis would have been HIPP eligible for each month that they were BadgerCare eligible during the nine-month analysis period. These eligible dates are also applied to the applicant's (case head's) dependents for inclusion in the analysis.

Several of the remaining data elements pulled from the HIPP applications also contained large amounts of missing data. It is possible that this information is completed through a follow-up process if the individual meets all of the preliminary requirements (listed previously) for enrollment in HIPP

Step Five

Based on the available data described in Step Four, our final working sample contained 262 applicants among the 40% group and 269 applicants among the no BadgerCare eligible children group. Using the case numbers for these applicants, we retrieved all Medicaid eligibility records for the nine-month analysis period for the case head and all associated dependents. The eligibility data provides the BadgerCare eligible months for each case head, and therefore for each dependent as well. The eligibility file also provides accurate gender, age and rate region data for determining the appropriate capitation payments for each individual in the analysis.

Step Six

Using the eligibility data obtained from the MEDS data warehouse, we were able to match the appropriate capitation rate with each recipient in each case. For all dependents, we used the first eligibility segment in our nine-month analysis period to establish their Medicaid eligibility category (i.e., BadgerCare, AFDC, Healthy Start, etc.). The first eligibility segment was chosen because we are "forcing" the case head's BadgerCare eligible months onto each dependent in the

case. Each dependent may have multiple eligibility segments during the case head's BadgerCare eligible months; therefore, we had to select a uniform eligibility segment for each dependent. This method is necessary because we are making the assumption that each dependent in a case would be covered by the employer policy during the case head's BadgerCare eligible months if the case head were allowed to enroll in HIPP. All case heads are assigned a BadgerCare capitation rate.

Matching the appropriate capitation rates to each individual in the case, multiplying the appropriate rate by the months eligible and summing across each case provided us with an estimate of actual costs to Medicaid during the case head's BadgerCare eligible months. It should be noted that most case heads in our analysis did not have a full nine months of BadgerCare eligibility. The analysis was conducted using only the BadgerCare eligible segments.

Step Seven

Once we generated an estimate of actual costs to Medicaid for each case, it was necessary to estimate the costs to Medicaid had each case been allowed to enroll in HIPP. This cost includes the case head's family coverage premium liability from their employer sponsored health care insurance and an estimate of Medicaid wrap-around costs, as discussed earlier. In the case-bycase cost-effectiveness test conducted by EDS during the HIPP application process, estimated wrap-around costs are assigned to each member of the case based on age and type of employer sponsored health care coverage. However, these estimates have not been updated since the inception of HIPP. In addition, the denied applications that we have access to do not contain 100% of the necessary health care plan information to accurately assign these estimated wraparound costs to each case. As an alternative, we chose to use an estimate of wrap-around costs based on the earlier program-wide cost-effectiveness analysis complete by APS in late 2004. During that analysis it was determined that 468 HIPP participants (106 case heads and 362 associated family members) accounted for 3,792 eligible months in calendar year 2003. Total wrap-around costs for this group was \$115,777.08, or an average of \$30.35 per eligible month. For our current analysis we are using this figure of \$30.35 per eligible month to estimate the wrap-around costs for our sample population.

Step Eight

At this point, the age, gender and rate region adjusted capitation rates were assigned to each individual in the case and were summed across the eligible months for each individual. Each individual total was then summed to create a total BadgerCare cost within each case. This total was compared to the sum of the family coverage premium across each case head's eligible months, plus the estimated capitation rate multiplied by the number of eligible months within the case to determine the estimated cost-effectiveness of enrolling each of the cases in HIPP. The results are discussed in the Findings section on the following page. Results by case are located in *Appendix B*.

Methodological Considerations

• Using the BadgerCare eligibility segments for the case head doesn't take into account if/when the children in the case would not be eligible for services, but rather, assumes they are always eligible under the case head's coverage. Depending on the capitation rates and

wrap-around costs for these children, the case's cost-effectiveness status may change. However, this method eliminates the need to reconcile the ineligible months during the case head's BadgerCare eligibility.

- Using an average wrap-around cost for each eligible month, as opposed to estimated wrap-around costs broken out by age and type of health insurance plan may affect the results of the analysis. A review of the estimated wrap-around costs suggests that using an average wrap-around cost for each eligible month may underestimate the total wrap-around costs for the case, which would provide a more conservative estimate of cost-effectiveness. However, this is directly dependent upon the mix of ages within a case in concert with the case's type of health plan.
- Adding wrap-around costs not covered in the BadgerCare capitation rate may allow a small number of cases in the analysis to become cost-effective if enrolled in HIPP. However, many of the costs not covered by the capitation rate are family planning related and would most likely have a negligible effect on the analysis results. Also, these estimated wrap-around costs have not been updated since the inception of HIPP.

Findings

Based on the analysis described above, only 51 (22%) of the 235⁵ cases in the final less than 40% group were found to be cost effective. Based on our analysis, the less than 40% group would have cost Medicaid approximately \$1,046,809 during our nine-month analysis period had they been enrolled in HIPP, as opposed to \$611,762 had they just been receiving their assigned capitation rates during that same period. This difference accounts for an increase of over \$435,000 in expenditures utilizing HIPP. Given that the employers in this group provide less than 40% of the employee's health insurance premium, and the average monthly employee share for family coverage among the 235 cases is \$577.24⁶, it is not surprising that the majority of these cases would not be cost-effective utilizing HIPP.

However, there are still 51 cases among the 235 who would be cost-effective on HIPP. These 51 cases would have saved an estimated \$55,000 during our nine-month analysis period or just over \$6,000 per month if allowed to enroll in HIPP. In addition, our analysis includes just under one quarter of the rejected less than 40% applications. If the same percentage of the remaining 764 applications who were not included in the analysis were to be found cost-effective as were found cost-effective in our analysis (22%), that would add an additional 168 cost-effective cases. These cost-effective cases would save Wisconsin Medicaid approximately \$20,000 per month above the \$6,000 from the original 51 cases in our sample. This would equate to an approximate

⁵ Although there were 262 less than 40% cases and 269 no BadgerCare children cases with valid family coverage premiums listed on their HIPP applications, several of these cases fell out of the analysis for other reasons, including lack of Medicaid eligibility segments or lack of BadgerCare eligibility segments in our analysis period. For example, some HIPP applicants were not identified in the MEDS eligibility records as the case head. In some of these cases, the actual case head did not have BadgerCare eligibility during our analysis period and therefore their case was not included in the analysis. All final estimates of cost savings are based on 235 less than 40% case heads and 230 case heads with no BadgerCare eligible children, representing 803 and 821 individuals, respectively.

⁶ For comparison, the no BadgerCare children group averaged \$342.11 in employee share for family coverage premiums.

annual savings of \$312,000 among just those applicants who were rejected because their employer does not pay at least 40% of their health insurance premium.

The findings among the no BadgerCare eligible children group are even more promising. Although, only 42% (96 of 230) of the cases were found to be cost-effective, those 96 cases would have saved Medicaid approximately \$95,500 over our nine-month analysis period or just over \$10,550 per month. Among this group we were only able to utilize 18% of the available applications, leaving 1,053 applications untested for cost-effectiveness. If 42% of these applications were found to be cost-effective as well, that would add an additional 442 cost-effective cases. If each case saved Wisconsin Medicaid the monthly average amount found among the 96 cost-effective cases (\$110), it would generate \$48,574 per month in additional savings. When combined with the 96 cases from the analysis, the total estimated annual savings among the cost-effective cases not enrolled in HIPP because they had no BadgerCare eligible children when they applied for the program would be \$709,487.

Combining the savings from the less than 40% group with the savings from the no BadgerCare eligible children group provides <u>an estimated total annual savings of \$1,021,487</u> for Wisconsin Medicaid. This analysis does not look at any cases whose HIPP eligibility was denied because they did not have access to family coverage or because their employer sponsored insurance was a self-funded plan. There may be additional savings to be found among these groups, as well.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This analysis confirms the validity of the two case-by-case cost-effectiveness criteria we tested, particularly the less than 40% employer contribution restriction. Cases where the employer pays less than 40% of their employees' health insurance premium and cases where there are no BadgerCare eligible children would generally not be cost-effective if allowed to enroll in HIPP.

However, the analysis also shows that several cases among these two groups **would be cost effective** if allowed to enroll in HIPP and that these cases could potentially save Wisconsin
Medicaid over \$1 million annually. This finding suggests that each HIPP applicant **should receive a full cost-effectiveness test when applying for the program,** as opposed to
eliminating cases if they fail to meet one of the above criteria. The cost of administering the
EDS cost-effectiveness test should only slightly diminish the cost savings that would be realized
from enrolling the new cost-effective applicants. Additional recommendations include:

- 1. All estimated wrap-around costs used in the current cost-effectiveness test should be updated to reflect more recent data. These wrap-around costs should be estimated using actual HIPP participant wrap-around expenses, if at all possible.
- 2. All capitation rates used in the cost-effectiveness test should be updated to reflect the most current age, gender and rate region adjusted rates.
- 3. Each HIPP participant should be assessed annually to determine their cost-effectiveness status. In cases where the participant is no longer cost-effective, it may be possible to move them off of HIPP and re-test them again the following year if they remain enrolled in BadgerCare.

Lastly, this analysis does not take into consideration the costs previously spent on developing the current enrollment process and cost-effectiveness algorithms. Nor does it consider the development costs of modifying the current application and enrollment process to test all applicants for cost-effectiveness. However, given that the program is already established, the cost of adding cases should not significantly impact the cost savings noted above. These costs should be discussed with EDS and State staff before moving forward with any recommended changes to the current HIPP enrollment process.

Appendix A – HIPP Application Variables

- 1. Case Number
- 2. Social Security Number
- 3. Last Name
- 4. First Name
- 5. Middle Initial
- 6. Eligible Date
- 7. Will the Applicant be Eligible For the Employer Insurance (Yes/No)
- 8. Effective Date
- 9. Is the Employer Plan Managed Care or Major Medical (Yes/No)
- 10. Is the Plan Self-Funded (Yes/No)
- 11. In Previous 18 Months has the Applicant Been Eligible for Family Coverage Paid 80% or More by the Employer (Yes/No)
- 12. Hours Worked
- 13. Insurer
- 14. Gross Premium for Employee Plus Child Coverage
- 15. Employer Share of the Employee Plus Child Premium
- 16. Percentage Employer Share of Employee Plus Child Premium
- 17. Employee Share of the Employee Plus Child Premium
- 18. Gross Premium for Family Coverage
- 19. Employer Share of the Family Coverage Premium
- 20. Percentage Employer Share of the Family Premium
- 21. Employee Share of the Family Premium
- 22. Insurance Type (Major Medical with routine or preventive care, Major Medical without routine or preventive care, Managed Care, Other)
- 23. Insurance Type Other (Description of Other Insurance Type)
- 24. Drug (Drug coverage, Yes/No)
- 25. Dental (Yes/No)
- 26. Vision (Yes/No)
- 27. Open Enrollment Start Date
- 28. Open Enrollment End Date
- 29. Comments
- 30. Wal-Mart (Yes/No)

<u>Appendix B – Complete Analysis Results</u>

Cost-Effectiveness Results Among the Less Than 40% Premium Group

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
CASE	CAP	HIPP COSTS	SAVINGS	WRAP	PREMIUMS	COST EFFECTIVE
	PAYMENTS	(E+F)	(B-C)	COSTS		'
1	4539.78	6692.85	-2153.07	1373.85	5319	NO
2	1872.15	2239.92	-367.77	366.36	1873.56	NO
3	281.1	547.5	-266.4	122.12	425.38	NO
4	3935.61	5070.42	-1134.81	1099.08	3971.34	NO
5	4762.26	5816.7	-1054.44	824.31	4992.39	NO
6	1335.9	1696.86	-360.96	366.36	1330.5	NO
7	2148.21	1301.58	846.63	549.54	752.04	YES
8	2321.58	7349.94	-5028.36	549.54	6800.4	NO
9	917.64	3060.24	-2142.6	244.24	2816	NO
10	1460.52	1059.3	401.22	305.3	754	YES
11	565.18	1221.18	-656	183.18	1038	NO
12	601.97	278.71	323.26	213.71	65	YES
13	2232.88	5429.84	-3196.96	732.72	4697.12	NO
14	1508.4	2606.4	-1098	274.77	2331.63	NO
15	3416.49	5108.31	-1691.82	1373.85	3734.46	NO
16	3501.75	5899.11	-2397.36	1068.55	4830.56	NO
17	482.46	1995.18	-1512.72	183.18	1812	NO
18	3806.6	9468.55	-5661.95	1068.55	8400	NO
19	2555.44	6122.88	-3567.44	732.72	5390.16	NO
20	2691.92	1791.44	900.48	854.84	936.6	YES
21	291.06	1069.41	-778.35	91.59	977.82	NO
22	809.25	1509.18	-699.93	183.18	1326	
23	1818.68	2588.48	-769.8	488.48	2100	NO
24	1156.15	1405.3	-249.15	305.3	1100	NO
25	1517.4	3265.92	-1748.52	549.54	2716.38	
26	5126.13	12825.45	-7699.32	824.31	12001.14	NO
27	206.33	830.75	-624.42	61.06	769.69	
28	1944.9	3385.45	-1440.55	457.95	2927.5	
29	3049.11	3312.72	-263.61	1099.08	2213.64	NO
30	2614.59	4219.11	-1604.52	1099.08	3120.03	NO
31	683.25	1960.77	-1277.52	274.77	1686	
32	515.84	2055.52	-1539.68	488.48	1567.04	NO
33	4895.92	1826.64	3069.28	1221.2	605.44	YES
34	2258.69	7261.38	-5002.69	641.13	6620.25	
35	1776.4	2049.68	-273.28	244.24	1805.44	
36	1887.76	4984.48	-3096.72	488.48	4496	
37	683.25	2631.93	-1948.68	183.18	2448.75	
38	7649.46	6514.02	1135.44	1923.39	4590.63	
39	3385.44	7330.59	-3945.15	1373.85	5956.74	
40	1982.16	1558.88	423.28	488.48	1070.4	YES

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
41	2635.83	6898.5	-4262.67	824.31	6074.19	'
42	2951.82	3462.03	-510.21	824.31	2637.72	
43	4393.41	4440.17	-46.76	1068.55	3371.62	
44	1603.68	3606.84	-2003.16	366.36	3240.48	
45	1295.52	286.98	1008.54	183.18	103.8	
46	4110.96	7324.24	-3213.28	854.84	6469.4	
47	2464.56	6602.48	-4137.92	732.72	5869.76	
48	143.32	1956.8	-1813.48	122.12	1834.68	
49	3173.31	6647.76	-3474.45	549.54	6098.22	
50	6082.02	11740.86	-5658.84	1099.08	10641.78	
51	3833.9	610.6	3223.3	610.6		YES
52	1970.22	1091.04	879.18	274.77	816.27	
53	4973.85	2858.31	2115.54	824.31	2034	
54	652.16	1824.32	-1172.16	488.48	1335.84	
55	2661.03	3016.35	-355.32	549.54	2466.81	
56	1095.03	1854.18	-759.15	183.18	1671	
57	2492.82	6214.59	-3721.77	824.31	5390.28	
58	3456	7742.4	-4286.4	1221.2	6521.2	
59	5809.86	6645.87	-836.10	1373.85	5272.02	
60	3435.21	3695.85	-260.64	1373.85	2322	NO
61	1456.38	2467.98	-1011.6	183.18	2284.8	
62	2123.73	5245.74	-3122.01	549.54	4696.2	
63	130.46	725.84	-595.38	122.12	603.72	
64	2661.03	7731.54	-5070.51	549.54	7182	
65	1222	1572.34	-350.34	183.18	1389.16	
66	1351.26	5671.71	-4320.45	824.31	4847.4	NO
67	2357.46	21797.73	-19440.27	274.77	21522.96	NO
68	5703.2	6813.04	-1109.84	976.96	5836.08	NO
69	5976.99	8146.17	-2169.18	1099.08	7047.09	NO
70	4490.85	5526.99	-1036.14	854.84	4672.15	NO
71	6650.64	3810.08	2840.56	1465.44	2344.64	YES
72	5476.23	5033.97	442.26	549.54	4484.43	YES
73	2012.65	2133.7	-121.05	763.25	1370.45	NO
74	6185.52	8739.72	-2554.2	1099.08	7640.64	NO
75	567.43	601.14	-33.71	61.06	540.08	NO
76	2546.1	6674.31	-4128.21	824.31	5850	NO
77	2402.6	1982.6	420	763.25	1219.35	YES
78	4032.24	5115.12	-1082.88	732.72	4382.4	NO
79	4132.26	4483.98	-351.72	1099.08	3384.9	NO
80	2034.27	970.02	1064.25	549.54	420.48	YES
81	4470.21	4429.08	41.13	1099.08	3330	YES
82	4187.79	10695.24	-6507.45	1373.85	9321.39	NO
83	2788.74	1899.54	889.2	549.54	1350	YES
84	146.38	335.15	-188.77	61.06	274.09	NO
85	1180.2	4308.71	-3128.51	213.71	4095	NO
86	3133.08	9275.85	-6142.77	1099.08	8176.77	NO

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
87	652.63	450.55	202.08	122.12	328.43	YES
88	2125.98	8083.17	-5957.19	549.54	7533.63	NO
89	2148.66	1204.02	944.64	549.54	654.48	
90	2784.48	7058.56	-4274.08	976.96	6081.6	NO
91	552.45	738.78	-186.33	91.59	647.19	NO
92	3517.14	4314.54	-797.4	549.54	3765	
93	2628.32	7194.72	-4566.4	976.96	6217.76	
94	2549.43	7124.31	-4574.88	824.31	6300	NO
95	5376.7	10377.08	-5000.38	854.84	9522.24	
96	2088.27	5127.48	-3039.21	549.54	4577.94	NO
97	4817.7	4734.99	82.71	1373.85	3361.14	YES
98	1124.52	3145.2	-2020.68	366.36	2778.84	NO
99	2875.59	1978.47	897.12	824.31	1154.16	YES
100	2704.95	5599.71	-2894.76	824.31	4775.4	NO
101	3250.17	7983.27	-4733.1	1099.08	6884.19	NO
102	716.22	1059.96	-343.74	274.77	785.19	NO
103	1787.76	7170.08	-5382.32	488.48	6681.6	NO
104	462.14	2842.76	-2380.62	122.12	2720.64	NO
105	1762.44	3418.6	-1656.16	610.6	2808	NO
106	3946.05	9502.02	-5555.97	824.31	8677.71	NO
107	1787.76	2040.48	-252.72	488.48	1552	NO
108	586.08	3359.52	-2773.44	1099.08	2260.44	NO
109	2807.46	3409.32	-601.86	732.72	2676.6	NO
110	3136.5	2192.31	944.19	824.31	1368	YES
111	2709.81	5432.94	-2723.13	824.31	4608.63	NO
112	1859.55	2632.95	-773.4	457.95	2175	NO
113	2767.04	6006.8	-3239.76	976.96	5029.84	NO
114	1505.28	2797.97	-1292.69	427.42	2370.55	NO
115	1536.66	2117.22	-580.56	366.36	1750.86	NO
116	1211.1	3886.2	-2675.1	305.3	3580.9	NO
117	876.9	1241.5	-364.6	183.18	1058.32	NO
118	2530.17	5615.28	-3085.11	824.31	4790.97	
119	502.76	3333.68	-2830.92	244.24	3089.44	
120	1068.96	3447.96	-2379	122.12	3325.84	
121	2480.66	4618.6	-2137.94	427.42	4191.18	
122	2190.7	4365.9	-2175.2	457.95	3907.95	
123	6934.77	8513.1	-1578.33	1373.85	7139.25	
124	2563.83	4824.54	-2260.71	549.54	4275	
125	2950.65	1702.08	1248.57	549.54	1152.54	
126	2414.02	4831.19	-2417.17	641.13	4190.06	
127	4426.38	7245.72	-2819.34	1648.62	5597.1	
128	4117.86	7173.72	-3055.86	1373.85	5799.87	
129	1601.88	5364.66	-3762.78	427.42	4937.24	
130	4076.73	8978.4	-4901.67	1373.85	7604.55	
131	1197.56	7356.93	-6159.37	427.42	6929.51	
132	238.74	209.56	29.18	61.06	148.5	YES

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
133	3244.25	2552.3	691.95	610.6	1941.7	'
134	1303.83	8891.55	-7587.72	274.77	8616.78	
135	2985.39	2576.37	409.02	366.36	2210.01	
136	3997.56	7196.91	-3199.35	1282.26	5914.65	
137	1954.62	4648.86	-2694.24	549.54	4099.32	
138	597.52	1290.76	-693.24	183.18	1107.58	
139	4062.69	4011.57	51.12	1373.85	2637.72	
140	1459.83	651.51	808.32	366.36	285.15	YES
141	7335.81	6967.62	368.19	1648.62	5319	YES
142	2623.84	9022.72	-6398.88	732.72	8290	NO
143	8070.84	6042.51	2028.33	2198.16	3844.35	YES
144	3383.28	5741.28	-2358	549.54	5191.74	NO
145	2736.2	2708.48	27.72	488.48	2220	YES
146	2563.83	8517.51	-5953.68	824.31	7693.2	NO
147	730.2	498.69	231.51	122.12	376.57	YES
148	2541.2	3499.9	-958.7	763.25	2736.65	NO
149	6564.78	8532.45	-1967.67	1373.85	7158.6	NO
150	338.04	2598.12	-2260.08	122.12	2476	NO
151	2840.49	5365.8	-2525.31	1099.08	4266.72	NO
152	714.03	638.76	75.27	274.77	363.99	YES
153	975	3577.76	-2602.76	244.24	3333.52	NO
154	1948.23	6685.38	-4737.15	1099.08	5586.3	NO
155	2442.2	1217.25	1224.95	610.6	606.65	YES
156	1568.52	2517.27	-948.75	549.54	1967.73	NO
157	588.94	1395.58	-806.64	183.18	1212.4	NO
158	757.35	1463.43	-706.08	183.18	1280.25	
159	586.08	8910	-8323.92	549.54	8360.46	
160	5621.44	3413.92	2207.52	1221.2	2192.72	_
161	4302.18	11669.22	-7367.04	1099.08	10570.14	
162	4081.14	7523.82	-3442.68	1099.08	6424.74	
163	853.2	2281.47	-1428.27	274.77	2006.7	
164	5715.54	2837.16	2878.38	824.31	2012.85	
165	1809.15	4063.15	-2254	457.95	3605.2	
166	2558.61	7176.78	-4618.17	1099.08	6077.7	
167	1565.1	790.02	775.08	305.3	484.72	
168	1670.83	2478.98	-808.15	427.42	2051.56	
169	6371.44	8819.76	-2448.32	1465.44	7354.32	
170	1416.42	8729.73	-7313.31	549.54	8180.19	
171	328.54	1151.09	-822.55 1746.16	91.59	1059.5	
172	1541.96	3288.12	-1746.16	366.36	2921.76	
173	2526.72	6177.52	-3650.8	732.72	5444.8	
174	2668.88	9182.96	-6514.08	732.72	8450.24	
175 176	259.48 716.07	1083.58 2718.03	-824.1	183.18 183.18	900.4 2534.85	
176	4965.66	6372.18	-2001.96 -1406.52	824.31	5547.87	
178	3965.49	6944.85	-2979.36	1373.85	5571	INO

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
179	3595.14	5142.51	-1547.37	1099.08	4043.43	<u> </u>
180	941.28	4306.8	-3365.52	549.54	3757.26	
181	5668.02	6316.83	-648.81	1099.08	5217.75	
182	2049.88	2120.48	-70.60	488.48	1632	
183	683.86	991.02	-307.16	244.24	746.78	
184	748.59	1097.7	-349.11	152.65	945.05	
185	2842.28	845.72	1996.56	488.48	357.24	
186	2333.07	7264.62	-4931.55	549.54	6715.08	
187	2011.23	6174.54	-4163.31	549.54	5625	
188	586.44	6453.18	-5866.74	549.54	5903.64	
189	4025.52	6037.2	-2011.68	1221.2	4816	
190	2142.09	6736.14	-4594.05	549.54	6186.6	NO
191	1138.75	3876	-2737.25	457.95	3418.05	NO
192	2570	2919.76	-349.76	366.36	2553.4	NO
193	2913.84	11801.52	-8887.68	549.54	11251.98	NO
194	5111.91	4558.77	553.14	824.31	3734.46	YES
195	3174.39	8292.24	-5117.85	1099.08	7193.16	NO
196	3250.17	6625.08	-3374.91	1099.08	5526	NO
197	2766.42	2039.31	727.11	824.31	1215	YES
198	942.24	910.16	32.08	244.24	665.92	YES
199	3250.32	2686.64	563.68	732.72	1953.92	YES
200	3551.4	18105.84	-14554.44	1099.08	17006.76	NO
201	1976.4	2828.35	-851.95	457.95	2370.4	NO
202	1497	3558.45	-2061.45	305.3	3253.15	NO
203	4329.68	5242.72	-913.04	732.72	4510	NO
204	2638.51	4523.82	-1885.31	641.13	3882.69	NO
205	4836.33	5078.25	-241.92	1099.08	3979.17	
206	3722.85	8937.27	-5214.42	1099.08	7838.19	
207	1737.36	5851.6	-4114.24	976.96	4874.64	
208	1998.4	3712.65	-1714.25	610.6	3102.05	
209	944.38	2223.26	-1278.88	244.24	1979.02	
210	1940.4	2869.68	-929.28	610.6	2259.08	
211	3075.4	3689.2	-613.8	457.95	3231.25	
212	600.6	731.36	-130.76	183.18	548.18	
213	284.4	331.86	-47.46	61.06	270.8	
214	2956.86	1808.64	1148.22	824.31	984.33	
215	3844.16	7195.28	-3351.12	1221.2	5974.08	
216	1638.88	3975.64	-2336.76	488.48	3487.16	
217 218	2393.3	3478.2	-1084.9	305.3	3172.9 105.8	
218	104.7 2682.78	136.33	-31.63	30.53	1122.27	
219	9386.91	1397.04 8058.87	1285.74 1328.04	274.77 2472.93	5585.94	
220	3002.49	6417.54	-3415.05	1099.08	5318.46	
221	1101.6	5820.3	-34 15.05 -4718.7	305.3	5515	
223	1441.3	636.3	805	305.3		YES
224	2335.27	4252.15	-1916.88	641.13	3611.02	
224	2000.21	4202.10	-1310.00	041.13	3011.02	INO

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
225	483.75	691.74	-207.99	152.65	539.09	NO
226	9323.19	5006.16	4317.03	2198.16	2808	YES
227	5860.8	4724.15	1136.65	1679.15	3045	YES
228	2239.79	5605.67	-3365.88	641.13	4964.54	NO
229	4830.96	5506.08	-675.12	976.96	4529.12	NO
230	3498.48	7789.2	-4290.72	732.72	7056.48	NO
231	6645.42	2367.27	4278.15	1099.08	1268.19	YES
232	928.74	633.6	295.14	244.24	389.36	YES
233	223.47	629.86	-406.39	61.06	568.8	NO
234	2140.02	6729.84	-4589.82	549.54	6180.3	NO
235	1173.04	789.22	383.82	610.6	178.62	YES

Cost-Effectiveness Results Among the No BadgerCare Eligible Children Group

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
CASE	CAP PAYMENTS	HIPP COSTS	SAVINGS	WRAP COSTS	PREMIUMS	COST EFFECTIVE
		(E+F)	(B-C)			
1	1747.04	1444.24	302.8	244.24	1200	YES
2	1595.08	1691.16	-96.08	488.48	1202.68	
3	4762.26	4860.81	-98.55	824.31	4036.5	
4	818.56	727.18	91.38	183.18		YES
5	2518.35	3175.25	-656.9	763.25	2412	NO
6	4486.95	5068.62	-581.67	1648.62	3420	NO
7	3665.07	4131.72	-466.65	1099.08	3032.64	NO
8	2239.8	1438.71	801.09	366.36	1072.35	YES
9	6353.19	4290.39	2062.8	1923.39	2367	YES
10	3506	1652.75	1853.25	457.95	1194.8	YES
11	3066.93	3151.08	-84.15	1099.08	2052	NO
12	5003.1	4105.71	897.39	824.31	3281.4	YES
13	5457.6	9640.17	-4182.57	1923.39	7716.78	NO
14	2702.07	4586.04	-1883.97	549.54	4036.5	NO
15	2084.35	2971.25	-886.9	457.95	2513.3	NO
16	594.81	4811.58	-4216.77	549.54	4262.04	NO
17	1234.44	942.56	291.88	366.36	576.2	
18	2309.94	2610.27	-300.33	274.77	2335.5	
19	332.58	2248.68	-1916.1	366.36	1882.32	
20	2300.15	1677	623.15	763.25	913.75	YES
21	904.12	1771.36	-867.24	122.12	1649.24	
22	1893.6	3591.18	-1697.58	1648.62	1942.56	
23	321.2	376.15	-54.95	61.06	315.09	
24	7408.17	4922.26	2485.91	1282.26	3640	
25	5491.02	3660.3	1830.72	1282.26	2378.04	
26	637.22	572.12	65.1	122.12		YES
27	221.24	411.78	-190.54	30.53	381.25	
28	3888.9	4979.61	-1090.71	1099.08	3880.53	
29	812.43	2477.34	-1664.91	549.54	1927.8	NO

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
30	608	4655.05	-4047.05	610.6	4044.45	
31	1819.62	1154.46	665.16	366.36	788.1	
32	1251.11	2633.05	-1381.94	427.42	2205.63	
33	2360.4	3238.13	-877.73	641.13	2597	
34	1368.8	2023.92	-655.12	244.24	1779.68	
35	592.42	781.8	-189.38	122.12	659.68	
36	1444.52	1216.48	228.04	488.48		YES
37	3544.11	3451.14	92.97	549.54	2901.6	
38	3320.04	2199.42	1120.62	915.9	1283.52	
39	748.14	588.24	159.9	244.24		YES
40	2900.96	4069.28	-1168.32	488.48	3580.8	
41	1747.32	3880.68	-2133.36	732.72	3147.96	
42	2388.42	5918.85	-3530.43	549.54	5369.31	
43	1909.52	2371.04	-461.52	488.48	1882.56	
44	1072.38	2406.36	-1333.98	366.36	2040	
45	4486.77	2653.02	1833.75	1373.85	1279.17	
46	620.1	4248.54	-3628.44	549.54	3699	
47	855.4	1562.55	-707.15	305.3	1257.25	
48	2968.64	3917.2	-948.56	1221.2	2696	
49	3345.21	3265.38	79.83	1373.85	1891.53	
50	2420.01	3165.21	-745.2	274.77	2890.44	
51	3726.63	2781.09	945.54	824.31	1956.78	
52	5806.8	3569.85	2236.95	1373.85	2196	
53	3383.28	3083.31	299.97	824.31	2259	
54	1090.56	913.68	176.88	274.77	638.91	
55	430.08	527.18	-97.1	183.18	344	NO
56	4969.26	3469.08	1500.18	1099.08	2370	YES
57	5160.24	6136.92	-976.68	1648.62	4488.3	NO
58	1164.88	1529.24	-364.36	366.36	1162.88	NO
59	3187.71	6905.97	-3718.26	824.31	6081.66	NO
60	1018.06	715.36	302.7	183.18	532.18	YES
61	5120.16	3763.92	1356.24	732.72	3031.2	YES
62	1505.34	1006.77	498.57	274.77	732	YES
63	4589.19	4252.32	336.87	1648.62	2603.7	YES
64	139.84	788.6	-648.76	122.12	666.48	NO
65	624.14	337.26	286.88	91.59	245.67	YES
66	923.94	981.63	-57.69	274.77	706.86	NO
67	3911.16	3009.24	901.92	732.72	2276.52	YES
68	1044.54	972.84	71.7	183.18	789.66	
69	2936.52	2465.52	471	488.48	1977.04	YES
70	1539.65	1822.15	-282.5	457.95	1364.2	NO
71	5044.77	3699.54	1345.23	549.54	3150	YES
72	2120.36	1751.56	368.8	610.6	1140.96	
73	2619.09	4244.31	-1625.22	824.31	3420	
74	970.06	612.18	357.88	183.18		YES
75	3250.17	3279.33	-29.16	1099.08	2180.25	NO

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
76	1416.42	3101.94	-1685.52	549.54	2552.4	-
77	3010.9	2649.2	361.7	915.9	1733.3	
78	2767.87	4833.22	-2065.35	854.84	3978.38	
79	1539.9	1061.01	478.89	274.77	786.24	
80	832.53	1266.09	-433.56	274.77	991.32	
81	2954.52	6826.68	-3872.16	1099.08	5727.6	
82	2464.56	4404.72	-1940.16	732.72	3672	
83	2585.7	4223.43	-1637.73	274.77	3948.66	
84	1422.78	1998.36	-575.58	366.36	1632	
85	2816.01	4275.36	-1459.35	824.31	3451.05	
86	3410.73	2713.5	697.23	1099.08	1614.42	
87	2348.13	1993.35	354.78	457.95	1535.4	
88	2951.82	7643.16	-4691.34	824.31	6818.85	
89	2333.88	2086.92	246.96	549.54	1537.38	
90	1179.3	1805.64	-626.34	457.95	1347.69	
91	238.69	424.14	-185.45	61.06	363.08	
92	6722.37	3513.96	3208.41	2198.16	1315.8	
93	1512.64	2581.96	-1069.32	366.36	2215.6	
94	4356.63	3802.41	554.22	824.31	2978.1	
95	4643.28	1493.1	3150.18	824.31	668.79	
96	337.2	979.06	-641.86	61.06		NO
97	7380.27	5434.83	1945.44	2747.7	2687.13	
98	1509.9	1842.82	-332.92	854.84	987.98	
99	299.48	578.62	-279.14	61.06	517.56	
100	3145.68	2854.08	291.6	1099.08	1755	
101	5458.86	2264.31	3194.55	824.31	1440	
102	3239.19	4769.01	-1529.82	1099.08	3669.93	
103	5927.2	3362.72	2564.48	976.96	2385.76	YES
104	3104.4	1389.84	1714.56	1099.08	290.76	YES
105	2091.32	2849.63	-758.31	641.13	2208.5	NO
106	2148.66	2743.02	-594.36	549.54	2193.48	NO
107	2931.03	3437.55	-506.52	1099.08	2338.47	NO
108	2546.6	1493.4	1053.2	366.36	1127.04	
109	6907.5	5657.85	1249.65	1923.39	3734.46	YES
110	1552.81	4038.44	-2485.63	213.71	3824.73	NO
111	2065.05	2582.19	-517.14	549.54	2032.65	
112	3936.15	2652.93	1283.22	1099.08	1553.85	YES
113	457.68	1135.98	-678.3	183.18	952.8	NO
114	5008.14	3494.34	1513.8	1648.62	1845.72	YES
115	1564.29	1897.42	-333.13	427.42	1470	NO
116	760.59	3869.73	-3109.14	549.54	3320.19	NO
117	2883.3	2030.6	852.7	610.6	1420	YES
118	2053.28	1581.52	471.76	244.24	1337.28	YES
119	2339.91	1979.01	360.9	824.31	1154.7	YES
120	4041.18	3917.7	123.48	1099.08	2818.62	YES
121	4414.41	4655.25	-240.84	1373.85	3281.4	NO

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
122	6202.56	3168.55	3034.01	1068.55	2100	
123	4250.52	3362.4	888.12	1373.85	1988.55	
124	618.75	534.35	84.4	122.12	412.23	
125	7496.48	3367.76	4128.72	2198.16	1169.6	
126	424.17	911.85	-487.68	183.18	728.67	
127	2849.85	1077.95	1771.9	457.95		YES
128	3515.36	3190.72	324.64	976.96	2213.76	
129	1632.75	721.74	911.01	274.77	446.97	
130	434.61	2209.2	-1774.59	91.59	2117.61	
131	4933.08	4256.73	676.35	1373.85	2882.88	
132	5991.12	2945.52	3045.6	824.31	2121.21	
133	3970.26	1770.48	2199.78	549.54	1220.94	
134	728.42	589.12	139.3	122.12		YES
135	3292.32	2737.14	555.18	549.54	2187.6	
136	3644.73	3233.7	411.03	1099.08	2134.62	
137	451.78	900.1	-448.32	122.12	777.98	
138	2936.34	2859.12	77.22	1099.08	1760.04	
139	1412.9	1987.25	-574.35	457.95	1529.3	
140	1623.87	2799.54	-1175.67	549.54	2250	
141	2142.09	3400.83	-1258.74	824.31	2576.52	
142	1508.4	2115.54	-607.14	549.54	1566	
143	2616.84	3303.54	-686.7	549.54	2754	
144	4129.2	6458.85	-2329.65	1373.85	5085	
145	2125.98	4575.33	-2449.35	549.54	4025.79	
146	3024.64	3825.04	-800.4	732.72	3092.32	
147	1048.56	1550.16	-501.6	366.36	1183.8	
148	1706.4	2275.26	-568.86	366.36	1908.9	NO
149	1791.86	1386.36	405.5	366.36	1020	YES
150	3242.28	1840.5	1401.78	732.72	1107.78	YES
151	4399.29	4160.61	238.68	824.31	3336.3	YES
152	2951.82	3366	-414.18	1099.08	2266.92	NO
153	1671.18	2606.24	-935.06	427.42	2178.82	NO
154	2172.87	5503.86	-3330.99	549.54	4954.32	NO
155	2777.32	3541.02	-763.7	854.84	2686.18	NO
156	4935.24	3494.34	1440.9	1648.62	1845.72	YES
157	2716.74	2297.28	419.46	1099.08	1198.2	YES
158	605.4	1110.16	-504.76	366.36	743.8	NO
159	3925.62	5554.62	-1629	1648.62	3906	NO
160	3539.52	3124.08	415.44	1099.08	2025	YES
161	2307.06	3830.94	-1523.88	549.54	3281.4	NO
162	1028.31	5475.39	-4447.08	366.36	5109.03	NO
163	1441.3	870.02	571.28	305.3	564.72	YES
164	2863.35	4105.71	-1242.36	824.31	3281.4	
165	674.4	1508.24	-833.84	244.24	1264	
166	667.29	336.32	330.97	122.12	214.2	
167	855.5	1259.45	-403.95	305.3	954.15	NO

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
168	2142.09	3544.56	-1402.47	549.54	2995.02	
169	1185.2	1165.16	20.04	366.36	798.8	
170	1411.92	3477.69	-2065.77	549.54	2928.15	
171	4049.71	3279.57	770.14	1495.97	1783.6	
172	2436.39	3848.85	-1412.46	1373.85	2475	
173	1155.35	2392.75	-1237.4	305.3	2087.45	
173	4989.04	3126.32	1862.72	1221.2	1905.12	
175	1137.36	2414.48	-1277.12	488.48	1926	
176	888.91	408.9	480.01	183.18	225.72	
177	3571.68	4313.6	-741.92	732.72	3580.88	
178	1660.2	2065.68	-405.48	732.72	1332.96	
179	252.09	499.12	-247.03	61.06	438.06	
180	1650.6	2024.55	-373.95	457.95	1566.6	
181	6065.76	2846.64	3219.12	1465.44	1381.2	
182	2155.51	3495.52	-1340.01	641.13	2854.39	
183	1988.65	3015.7	-1027.05	610.6	2405.1	
184	756.27	1077.18	-320.91	183.18	894	
185	1935.92	2425.28	-489.36	488.48	1936.8	
186	180.54	412.42	-231.88	61.06	351.36	
187	993.04	521.52	471.52	122.12	399.4	
188	4212.9	2784.78	1428.12	915.9	1868.88	
189	2626.24	4849.76	-2223.52	976.96	3872.8	
190	7085.16	8137.35	-1052.19	1648.62	6488.73	
191	1957.02	2067.42	-110.4	549.54	1517.88	
192	2190.23	4716.25	-2526.02	641.13	4075.12	
193	1688.61	5113.71	-3425.1	427.42	4686.29	
194	2503.12	4144.96	-1641.84	976.96	3168	NO
195	1447.38	3840.3	-2392.92	366.36	3473.94	NO
196	2237.1	2257.2	-20.10	732.72	1524.48	NO
197	2631.42	4578.03	-1946.61	549.54	4028.49	NO
198	2841.57	4203	-1361.43	1099.08	3103.92	NO
199	575.64	713.54	-137.9	244.24	469.3	NO
200	3954.18	2451.54	1502.64	549.54	1902	YES
201	4594.77	4026.06	568.71	1099.08	2926.98	YES
202	357.46	593.06	-235.6	61.06	532	NO
203	1758.33	3149.64	-1391.31	274.77	2874.87	NO
204	4677.3	3075.48	1601.82	1648.62	1426.86	YES
205	3665.07	6189.48	-2524.41	1099.08	5090.4	NO
206	930.62	857.5	73.12	305.3	552.2	YES
207	2772.63	3480.21	-707.58	824.31	2655.9	NO
208	3961.44	6416.46	-2455.02	1373.85	5042.61	NO
209	2179.98	3114.54	-934.56	549.54	2565	
210	4986.27	5211.72	-225.45	1648.62	3563.1	
211	1653.54	2702.42	-1048.88	427.42	2275	
212	5184.69	3682.14	1502.55	854.84	2827.3	
213	3172.04	1521.08	1650.96	610.6	910.48	YES

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G
214	650.45	684.24	-33.79	122.12	562.12	NO
215	959.86	912.38	47.48	183.18	729.2	YES
216	4068.27	4093.02	-24.75	1099.08	2993.94	NO
217	1662.74	955.7	707.04	366.36	589.34	YES
218	1883.94	1731.36	152.58	366.36	1365	YES
219	2771.82	3402.36	-630.54	824.31	2578.05	NO
220	4642.56	4643.01	-0.45	1373.85	3269.16	NO
221	2341.71	4222.8	-1881.09	1648.62	2574.18	NO
222	1670.83	3605.98	-1935.15	427.42	3178.56	NO
223	2124.64	3114.84	-990.2	854.84	2260	NO
224	2179.98	5173.47	-2993.49	824.31	4349.16	NO
225	6885.27	6141.69	743.58	1099.08	5042.61	YES
226	541.29	673.71	-132.42	91.59	582.12	NO
227	1026.48	2305.86	-1279.38	366.36	1939.5	NO
228	3451.95	5809.41	-2357.46	824.31	4985.1	NO
229	6726.33	5676.48	1049.85	2472.93	3203.55	YES
230	4512.24	2964.42	1547.82	1648.62	1315.8	YES